

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

**KRISTEN R, through her guardian and parent,  
ROBIN PICKERING,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**No. CIV-15-0277 RB/LAM**

**EASTERN NEW MEXICO MENTAL RETARDATION  
SERVICES d/b/a EASTERN NEW MEXICO  
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES  
FOR THE HANDICAPPED, INC., a/k/a “ENMRSRH”, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION  
OF ALL PRE-TRIAL DEADLINES**

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Plaintiff's *Motion for Extension of all Pre-Trial Deadlines* [Doc. 31], filed December 18, 2015. Defendants have not filed a response to the motion, and the time for responding has passed. “The failure of a party to file and serve a response in opposition to a motion within the time prescribed for doing so constitutes consent to grant the motion.” D.N.M. LR-Civ. 7.1(b). Having considered the motion and record of the case, and having consulted with the presiding judge in this case, the Court **FINDS** that the motion is well-taken and shall be **GRANTED**. Because the discovery deadline will now be *after* the scheduled settlement conference in this case, the Court will also vacate the April 22, 2016 settlement conference and reset it at a later date.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's *Motion for Extension of all Pre-Trial Deadlines* [Doc. 31] is **GRANTED**, and the following deadlines are extended as follows:<sup>1</sup>

1.	Termination date for discovery:	<b>May 23, 2016</b>
2.	Discovery motions:	<b>June 12, 2016</b>
3.	Plaintiff's expert reports:	<b>March 31, 2016</b>
4.	Defendants' expert reports:	<b>April 25, 2016</b>
5.	Pretrial motions:	<b>July 8, 2016</b>
6.	Pretrial order from Plaintiff to Defendant:	<b>September 26, 2016</b>
7.	Pretrial order from Defendant to the Court:	<b>October 11, 2016</b>

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the settlement conference presently set for April 22, 2016 is hereby **VACATED** and will be rescheduled at a later date.

*These deadlines shall not be extended again without approval of the Court upon a motion setting forth exceptional cause for extension. The press of other cases, vacations and intervening holidays are not usually considered to be exceptional circumstances.*

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
LOURDES A. MARTÍNEZ  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that Plaintiff states that she expects needing an additional three months to complete discovery (Doc. 31 at 1); however, Plaintiff only asks for a two-month extension of all of the deadlines in this case (*id.* at 2). To be clear, the Court is granting this motion as to the two-month extension of the deadlines as set forth on page 2 of Plaintiff's motion.